

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 16-24 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicants submit this Amendment in response to the Decision On Appeal and the Examiner's Answer. The Examiner's Answer specifies modified rejections in view of the amendments made in the Amendment of February 5, 2004.

Claims 1, 9 and 17-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,308). The Examiner stated essentially that Saito teaches all the limitations of claim 1, 9 and 17-21.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "injection hole post structures provided in an area near said injection hole formed of the same material as said post structures, wherein said injection hole post structures are arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns." Claim 9 claims, *inter alia*, "a plurality of injection hole post structures provided between the substrate end in said injection hole and said display area on said one substrate for substantially preventing the pollutant seeped from said end-sealing material from penetrating into said display area, wherein said plurality of injection hole post structures are arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns."

Saito teaches a liquid crystal display having one or more injection ports (see col. 9, lines 2-4). Saito does not teach or suggest injection hole post structures arranged in a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 9. Nowhere does Saito teach injection ports including rows and columns of injection hole post structures. Therefore, Saito fails to teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 9.

Claim 17 depends from claim 1. Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 6 (addressed below). Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 9. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito. The Examiner stated essentially that Saito teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 3, 5, 10, and 11.

Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Ohashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,798,813). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Saito and Ohashi teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 2 and 16.

Claims 2 and 16 depend from claim 1. Claims 2 and 16 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6, 8, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Nakanowatari (U.S. Patent No. 4,820,025). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Saito and Nakanowatari teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 6, 8, 18 and 19.

Claim 6 claims, *inter alia*, "a sealing material for connecting a pair of substrates outside the display area, and forming an open injection hole for injecting liquid crystal therethrough,

wherein said sealing material has a projecting portion formed by bending said sealing material back on itself forming an acute angle.”

Saito teaches an injection hole formed in a strip spacer (SPC-S) formed as a rectangle (see Figures 2 and 8). No portion of the strip spacer (SPC-S) of Saito is bent at an acute angle. The seal material (SL) formed around the strip spacer (SPC-S) will conform to the angles of the strip spacer (SPC-S), and thus will conform to the right angles of the strip spacer (SPC-S). Therefore, Saito fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 6.

Nakanowatari teaches one part of a sealing member 3 is opened to constitute an injection hole 5 formed at a corner position of the substrates (see col. 3, lines 7-10 and Figure 3). Nakanowatari does not teach or suggest that a “sealing material has a projecting portion formed by bending said sealing material back on itself forming an acute angle” as claimed in Claim 6. It is clear from Figure 3 of Nakanowatari that the portion of the sealing member 3 forming the injection hole 5 is bent at an angle greater than 90 degrees, an obtuse angle. Nakanowatari does not teach or suggest a sealing material having a projecting portion formed by bending said sealing material back on itself forming an acute angle, essentially as claimed in Claim 6. Therefore, Nakanowatari fails to sure the deficiencies of Saito.

The combined teachings of Saito and Nakanowatari fail to teach or suggest that a “sealing material has a projecting portion formed by bending said sealing material back on itself forming an acute angle” as claimed in claim 6.

New claims 22-24 depend from claim 9. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 9. Therefore, claims 22-24 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 16-24 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated. The Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. For the forgoing reasons, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicants

**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889